



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

see into the man's heart, he cannot tell him, with certainty, whether his sins are really forgiven by God or not.

But may the priest tell the man that his forgiveness is dependant on the amount of contrition in his own breast, and, therefore, known with certainty to God only; and known to man himself only so far as he knows and can judge of the sincerity of his own repentance?

No; the priest may not tell him this. "The faithful are to be informed, in the first place, *why* the Redeemer was pleased to give it (penance) a place among the sacraments. His object was, no doubt, to remove, in a great measure, all uncertainty as to the pardon of sin pronounced by our Lord. . . . Pronouncing upon his own actions, every man has reason to question the accuracy of his own judgment; and hence, on the sincerity of interior penance, the mind must be held in anxious suspense. To calm this our solicitude, the Redeemer instituted the Sacrament of Penance, in which we cherish a well-founded hope that our sins are forgiven us by the absolution of the priest; and the faith which we justly have in the efficacy of the sacraments has much influence in tranquillizing the troubled conscience, and giving peace to the soul."—p. 256. So that the man's assurance of pardon is not to rest on his own judgment of the "sincerity of interior penance," but upon the absolution of the priest, as having been expressly instituted to free the man from uncertainty about his own sincerity.

And this is made plainer still by the words that follow—"The voice of the priest, who is legitimately constituted a minister for the remission of sins, is to be heard as that of Christ himself, who said to the lame man, 'Son, be of good cheer, thy sins are forgiven thee.'"—p. 256.

We can understand, and deeply feel for, the overwhelming anxieties of a sincere and earnest priest, who has longed to tell the people that they were not to rest upon his words, "I absolve thee," even after the most careful exercise of his fallible judgment; but that they must judge of God's forgiveness by the sincerity of their own contrition. We can understand, and deeply feel for, his perplexity, when he comes to find that he is expected to tell them that his words are meant to secure them against any doubt of their own sincerity; and that they are to hear his words as if they heard Christ himself saying to them "thy sins are forgiven thee."

The difference is, that Christ could see into the hearts of those he spoke to, and the priest cannot.

It is this that must overwhelm the heart of a conscientious and earnest priest with a sense of responsibility too great for man to bear.

How can he "discharge the functions of Jesus Christ," without having the knowledge required for it?

If Christ had called any man to "discharge his own functions," would he not also have given him the requisite knowledge wherewith to do it?

Gladly would we aid any sincere and earnest man to see his way in such perplexity.

We must consider the means of knowledge which God has given us. Our faculties are very limited; when we strive to see every little detail at one view, we lose sight of the whole, and get into an inextricable maze, as the able writers of the Trent Catechism did. We must be content to begin by seeing LEADING TRUTHS and LEADING ERRORS. When we see so much, we can go on to examine the details. This is the way of knowledge among men.

There is a matter in this question, which is EITHER a leading truth, or a leading error. It is the very form of "the Sacrament of Penance." Let us examine this well. "Every sacrament consists of two things—'matter,' which is called the element, and 'form,' which is commonly called the Word. . . . In the sacraments of the New Law, the form is so definite, that any—even a casual deviation from it—renders the sacrament null. . . . These, then, are the parts which belong to the nature and substance of the sacraments, and of which every sacrament is necessarily composed."—Catechism, pp. 145 and 146.

"The words that compose THE FORM (of the Sacrament of Penance) are—'I ABSOLVE THEE.'"—Catechism, p. 259.

Let it be observed, then, that any deviation from this form, renders the sacrament null.

And so Thomas Aquinas says—"In sacramental absolution it would not be sufficient to say—Almighty God have mercy on thee, or, God grant unto thee absolution and forgiveness; because, by these words the priest does not signify that absolution is done, but only entreats that it may be done."

And Cardinal Bellarmine says, that absolution given with such a condition as this—"If thou dost believe and repent as thou oughtest to do," would not be valid.

And the Council of Trent itself says—"The holy synod also teaches that THE FORM of the sacrament of penance, in which its force is especially contained, is placed in those words of the minister—"I ABSOLVE THEE."† So, without those words, there can be no sacrament, no pardon, no salvation, for the vast majority of men whose contrition is imperfect.

* In sacramentali absolutione non sufficeret dicere, miseretur tui omnipotens Deus; vel, absolvetur et remissionem tibi tribuat Deus; quia per hec verba absolutionem non significat fieri, sed petit ut fiat.—Thom. part. iii., quest. 84, art. 3, ad 1.

† Docet præterea sancta Synodus, sacramenti Pœnitentiæ formam, in qua præcipue ipsius vis est, in illis ministris verbis positam esse; ego te absolvo, &c.—Council of Trent, session 14. c. 3.

Yet, no fact in the history of the Church is more certain than this, that those words, "I absolve thee," were never contained in any form of absolution used in the Church, for more than a THOUSAND YEARS.

During all that time, the forms of absolution used in the Church were always in that form which the Church of Rome now pronounces to be ineffectual for the pardoning of sin. "Almighty God have compassion on thee, and put away all thy sins," was the ancient form of absolution in the Church of Rome itself.†

So here is a LEADING ERROR at the foundation, and the whole system of the Church of Rome about absolution breaks down altogether.

Those who would get free from the perplexities in which the Council of Trent and the catechism involve priests, in the matter of forgiving men's sins, must seek elsewhere for something that can stand examination, and satisfy the conscience of an earnest man.

It is at least something to learn *why* and in *what*, we have laboured in vain. Let any such priest as we are writing of, only try and imagine himself living in the Church of Rome 800 years ago, and using the form of absolution *she* then used; and let him consider what opinions he would then have entertained, and what instruction he would have given to the people about absolution; or let him suppose himself at liberty now to use only the ancient forms, and let him consider how easily he could then satisfy his own mind and conscience, about the way he would explain it to the people.

In this way alone, can he understand the cause of his perplexities, and the way to escape from them.

To aid those who may wish to investigate this further, we shall, in a future number, show what were the views of the Fathers about absolution, while the ancient form of absolution was in use.

CELIBACY OF THE CLERGY.

VARIOUS attempts at reform have, from time to time, been made within the bosom of the Church of Rome, both before and subsequent to the great movement of the sixteenth century, which restored religious freedom to a large part of Europe, and which is commonly known by the name of the Reformation. These attempts, it is true, have, for the most part, failed to bring about any important change, either in the doctrine or discipline of the Roman Catholic Church; but the consideration of them is important, especially at the present time, inasmuch as they prove that a deep-rooted feeling of dissatisfaction with many parts of the system of the Church of Rome has always more or less existed within that Church, and has rarely failed to manifest itself, whenever external circumstances permitted its members to declare their real sentiments openly and without reserve.

One of the most remarkable circumstances which has characterized these movements of the popular mind is this, that the same points of the Romish system have almost always been selected, as those in which reform was most imperatively demanded. From the contests of the Calixtines and the Laborites of the fifteenth century, down to the religious movements in Germany, in our own time, the instinct of sober, thinking men has always fixed upon some few crying grievances in the system of the Church of Rome, which were felt to press most heavily, and which were seen to be plainly repugnant to the Word of God. If a patient always complains to his physician that he feels pains in the same part of his body, it is an evident sign that some evil is lurking there, for which a remedy is needed; and the same maxim is no less applicable to the disorders of the religious system.

Among the grievances just adverted to, there is one, against which the most urgent remonstrances have at various times been addressed to the Court of Rome—namely, the compulsory celibacy of the clergy. We are anxious to invite the attention of our readers to this subject for two reasons. In the first place, we believe that the social evils resulting from this rule, both to clergy and laity, can scarcely be overrated; and we have reason to think, moreover, that not a few of the Roman Catholic clergy themselves would be glad to be set free from a restriction, which, as we hope presently to prove, is condemned alike by Scripture, reason, and experience.

We can hardly adduce better proof of the sentiments of many of the clergy on this important question, than is afforded by a remarkable Encyclical Letter, addressed by the late Pope, Gregory XVI., to the bishops of Poland in the year 1831. At the outset of this letter, the Pope alludes to certain unquiet spirits who had been for many years troubling the Holy See with unreasonable requests—requests, which though always refused, were, with unconquerable pertinacity, continually renewed; and that the repeal of the law of clerical celibacy was one of these "unreasonable requests," is evident from the passage which follows—

* We might, perhaps, safely say 1,300 years; but we wish to be under, rather than over.

† Absolutio criminum. Miseretur tui omnipotens Deus, et dimittat tibi omnia peccata tua, &c.—Confiteentium ceremoniæ antiquæ, Edit. Colon., ann. 1536.

"We desire, venerable brethren, to excite your constancy on behalf of religion, against a most disgraceful conspiracy with regard to clerical celibacy, which you know is spreading more widely every day, and which is promoted not only by pernicious philosophers of our time, but even by certain persons of the ecclesiastical order, who, forgetful of their character and office, and hurried away by the blandishments of pleasure, have even dared, in some places, to address public and repeated requests to their princes for the overthrow of this holy rule of discipline.

We consider that the facts here stated, which were so reluctantly alluded to by Pope Gregory XVI., are deserving of the serious attention of all who are anxious for the welfare of the Roman Catholic Church. It must have been a deep consciousness of the evils which the law of constrained celibacy was inflicting on the Church, that induced a large number of Roman Catholic ecclesiastics to appeal to their temporal princes against the known wishes of their spiritual head. Gregory XVI. stated, as we have seen, that the feeling against clerical celibacy was entertained both by clergy and laity, and was "spreading more widely every day." We do not believe that the movement for reform in this matter, to which the Pope alludes, ever extended to this country; but we see no reason why the Roman Catholic clergy of Ireland should feel less deeply, or be less vitally interested in this question, than their brethren on the Continent. In approaching this subject we have no wish or intention whatever to discuss it in an unfriendly or hostile spirit. Our only object is to set before our readers some of the serious objections to which the law of clerical celibacy is liable. For the present we shall confine our remarks to the case of the clergy.

Let us suppose, then, some young priest, who has just been ordained, to be confined to the retirement of a country parish, in a village where he has only the society of his clerk and his servant. His parishioners, being, for the most part, plain country folk, devoid of literary tastes and acquirements, are unable to afford him any comfort in his solitude. His duties, save on the Sunday, consist chiefly in the performance of a few routine services, which habit soon renders monotonous. Study, perhaps, has few charms for him; for during his education at Maynooth his reading was, for the most part, confined to dry treatises on dogmatic theology. The young man, previous to his ordination, had anticipated a pleasant existence in the ecclesiastical state; but he very soon begins to experience a foretaste of the irksome feeling of privation and constraint which compulsory celibacy almost inevitably occasions. Should he be placed within the reach of female society, he is obliged to regard it with suspicion and distrust. However carefully he may guard all approaches to his heart, yet nature cannot be thwarted with impunity; unless he be singularly cold and apathetic, his breast will probably be the scene of many a weary struggle, because his vow obliges him to fight incessantly against feelings which are constituent parts of man's nature, and can never be wholly eradicated. All the diversified attractions which others find in mixed social intercourse are so many new snares and temptations in his path. And, as if to crown the difficulties of his position, he is obliged, by the nature of his ministry, to be constantly brought into contact with young persons of the other sex, whose hearts are laid open before him, and whose most secret thoughts he is forced to inquire into. Surely, it is most unreasonable to expect that human nature can bear this trial without a struggle of the most painful kind.

Nor is this all. If there was a prospect, however remote, that this state of things would ever come to an end, perhaps our young priest might be enabled to bear it with composure. If he could look forward to a time when he would be set free from this yoke of bondage—when the loneliness of his solitary dwelling would be lit up by the smile of kind, familiar faces, knit to himself by the dearest ties of earthly relationship—then, perchance, he might be enabled with more ease to school his wayward heart into submission. Hope and fancy might then combine to diffuse a bright glow of anticipated happiness over some future stage of his existence, some rays of which would cheer and enliven the period of his early probation. But, alas! the future has no such prospect in store for him. His celibacy is to last for life. The stern law of his Church even forbids him the companionship of any female relative of his own; and thus, if he looks forward at all into futurity, he sees himself lonely and desolate, with faculties impaired and strength decayed, dependant upon strangers for the simplest acts of kindness that he needs. As he gradually drops into the grave, there is no one to cheer or console him; no voice of kindly sympathy to greet his ear. Can we wonder, then, if gloom, moroseness, and austerity should too often take possession of the minds of those who through life have been exposed to such an ordeal as this?

And now, what reason is alleged for the maintenance of a system, the features of which we have thus faintly at-

* Hic autem vestram volumus excitatam pro religione constantiam adversus fœdissimam in clericali celibatu conjurationem, quam nostris effervere in dies latius, contentibus cum perditionis nostræ ovi philosophia nonnullis etiam ex ipso ecclesiastico ordine, qui personæ oblitæ munericis etiam, ac blanditiis abrepti voluptatum, eo loquentur adhibere, ut publicas etiam atque iteratas aliquibus in locis aut sint adhibere principibus postulationes ad disciplinam illam sanctissimam infringendam.—Vide "Quarterly Review," vol. 75, p. 163 (June, 1844), where further extracts from this encyclical letter will be found.

tempted to delineate? If any young priest, as he paces his solitary chamber, should ask himself, "Why am I and others subjected to this cruel and unnatural constraint?" what answer can he give to the inquiry? Weighed down, as too many of them are, by a yoke which presses heavily upon every hour of their existence, it can surely be no just matter of surprise that this law of compulsory celibacy should suggest to them to inquire into the *right* which the rulers of their Church had to impose it.

If a Roman Catholic priest opens the first page of the Bible, what declaration does he find inscribed on it? "It is not good for man to be alone."—Gen. ii. 18. These words were spoken by God, who had created man, and who knew what was in man. Marriage was the remedy which the Almighty himself appointed; and if human nature required this remedy before the fall, while man's feelings and affections were yet pure and unsullied, how much more necessary to his happiness is this remedy now, when sin has introduced so many elements of disturbance into his system!

It is said, indeed, by Bellarmine and others, who have attempted to defend the law of clerical celibacy, that the married state is inconsistent with the sanctity of the clerical character. "Matrimony," saith he, "prevents the priest from performing the duty of sacrificing, because the utmost purity and sanctity is required in it." Such an argument comes with a very ill grace from a divine of the Church of Rome, which holds that marriage is a sacrament, and that, like the other sacraments, it "confers grace."† How can the same ordinance confer divine grace, and destroy personal holiness? The two things are manifestly inconsistent.

But we need not argue the question upon this ground. A glance at the history of the Old and New Testaments is sufficient to prove that the married state is perfectly consistent with the proper discharge of the holiest and most solemn duties. The 21st chapter of the Book of Leviticus, which specially enjoined the Jewish priests that "they should be holy, because the Lord their God was holy," in the *very same passage* lays down numerous rules regarding the marriage of priests. The High Priest himself, whose duty it was to offer sacrifice on the great day of atonement, in the Holy of Holies, in the immediate presence of God, was distinctly *commanded* to be married.—Lev. xxi. 13. So weak is Bellarmine's assertion that the duty of offering sacrifice could not fitly be performed by a married priest, if we should even grant that it is any part of the duty of a Christian minister to offer sacrifice—an assumption which we have in another column proved to be untenable.

When we come to the New Testament, however, the evidence for the lawfulness of clerical marriage becomes abundantly convincing. If, as many Romanist writers are fond of asserting, it be really a profanation that the Eucharist should be consecrated by married men, how comes it to pass that St. Paul speaks of this so-called profanation without the slightest trace of censure or disapproval? "A bishop," saith he, "must be blameless, the husband of one wife, having his children in subjection with all gravity."—1 Tim. iii. 2, 4. And, again, he thus writes to Titus—"For this cause I left thee in Crete, that thou shouldst ordain priests in every city, if any be blameless, the husband of one wife."—Tit. i. 5, 6. If our Lord were again to come upon earth and to act as the Church of Rome does, He would, doubtless, choose unmarried men for his Apostles. Yet, whom did He choose? If we believe the early Fathers, the great majority of the Apostles were married men. "All the Apostles," writes St. Ambrose, "with the exception of St. John and St. Paul, were married."‡

As early as the time of Clemens Alexandrinus, certain heretics began to condemn marriage; and Clemens, as Eusebius tells us, "reckons up the Apostles that were married, to refute those who disapproved of it. Will they," said he, "condemn the Apostles themselves? For St. Peter and St. Philip begat children."§

Scripture alludes to St. Peter's marriage on two occasions; once, where it speaks of his wife's mother (Mark i. 30); and, again, St. Paul, at a later period, refers to St. Peter's wife in one of his epistles.—1 Cor. ix. 5. Did our space permit, we should wish to quote the account given by Eusebius, of the touching interview between St. Peter and his wife, before the latter was led away to martyrdom. We think that the Church of Rome has hardly done justice to the domestic partner of him whom they claim as their own immediate founder. That Church has obviously no liking for Peter's wife. Rome has granted the honours of canonization to all the holy persons named or alluded to in the New Testament,

and even to some who are not named there—for example, the father and mother of the Virgin Mary; but she has taken special care *not* to grant this honour to the wife of St. Peter although St. Paul represents her as accompanying the Apostle in his painful and perilous journeys. So successful has the Church of Rome been in saying nothing about this lady, that a great many Romanists never heard her mentioned all their lives; and, perhaps, it may be new to many of our readers, to be told that St. Peter ever had a wife at all.

To return, however, to the arguments which are alleged on behalf of clerical celibacy. We are saved the trouble of citing any further texts from Scripture, because Bellarmine is fairly obliged to surrender this part of the question. "There is no precept for celibacy," saith he, "in the whole of Scripture."* This is an important admission; but we may go a good deal farther than this. The prohibition of sacerdotal marriage is unknown to the oldest monuments of the Church. No vestige of the prohibition is to be found in the long lapse of three hundred years after the apostolic age. We will quote but a single testimony from Clemens Alexandrinus:—"God," saith he, "allows every man, whether priest, deacon, or layman, to be the husband of one wife."† An attempt was made, indeed, in the Council of Nice, to impose the yoke of celibacy upon the clergy, but the council rejected the proposal. Surely, the Roman Catholic clergy of Ireland may ask with reason, why they are subjected to a restriction not only opposed to Scripture (which places "forbidding to marry" among the "doctrines of devils."—1 Tim. iv. 1, 3) but unknown to the best and purest ages of the Church.

It would be tedious to go through the various steps by which this law of clerical celibacy—the child, not of religion and Christianity, but of superstition and worldly policy—was at length imposed upon the clergy of the Western Church. For many centuries, indeed, no attempt was made to enforce a prohibition which had always been found to be productive of the most serious evils, both to religion and morals. In the Canon Law, a long list is given of Popes who were either sons of Popes or else of other bishops. "Many persons," saith Gratian, "are found to have governed the Apostolic See, who were born of priests."‡ Osius, Boniface, Felix, Agapitus, Theodorus, Silverius (who was son of Pope Silverius), Deusdedit, Felix III., and various other Popes, were all in this condition. We have given conclusive evidence, moreover, in former numbers of this journal, that the ancient bishops of the Irish Church were married, and that the law of clerical celibacy was a late innovation, unknown to the early Church history of our own island.

At length, in the middle of the eleventh century, A.D., 1074, Pope Gregory VII., after a fierce struggle, succeeded in imposing this heavy yoke upon the clergy of the Church of Rome. We have no space to detail the fearful amount of misery and disorder which the enforcement of this arbitrary law, by an old man, then tottering on the verge of the grave, occasioned throughout Europe. Perhaps there is no single enactment of ancient or modern times which has proved so fatally effective in destroying the happiness of countless thousands who have since come under its influence. We have no wish to judge Gregory VII. hardly. Perhaps he thought he was acting for the benefit of the Church in severing her ministers from all worldly ties, and binding them more closely to their spiritual head. There can be no question that it is to this, more than to any other law of the Church of Rome, that we are to attribute the enormous temporal power which that Church has since possessed; but we can confidently affirm, that all who feel a due regard for the interests of morality, and are familiar with the gloomy annals of ecclesiastical biography, will have reason to feel that this temporal power has been too dearly purchased.

In 1564, Charles IX., King of France, addressed a petition to Pope Pius IV., praying for the repeal of the law of clerical celibacy. The petition was referred to the Council of Trent, which was then sitting; and the historian of the council informs us of the purport of the speech then delivered by Cardinal di Carpi, which induced the Tridentine Fathers to reject the petition. "It is plain," said he, "that married priests will turn their affections and love to their wives and children, and they would thus be drawn away from their dependance on the Pope. In a little while the authority of the Holy See would then be limited to the city of Rome."§ Those of our readers who are inclined to feel surprise that the Court of Rome has always adhered with such pertinacity to the law of clerical celibacy, will find, in this short extract, the key to the policy which she has so long and so steadily pursued.

Writing, as we have done, with an anxious desire to convince the judgments of our readers, we have hitherto touched but lightly on the physical sufferings of some of the

unhappy victims of compulsory celibacy. Jerome, who was one of its votaries, drew a vivid picture of the misery he endured. He describes himself as sitting with scorpions in a frightful solitude, parched with the rays of the sun, clothed in sackcloth, pale with fasting, quenching his thirst from the cold spring, while his blood boiled with undue emotion.* St. Francis frequently threw himself, in winter, into a pit full of icy water.† Godric, an English hermit, clothed himself in haircloth, and, during the wintry frost and snow, he immersed himself in the stream of the Werus, up to the neck, and spent the whole night singing psalms.‡ Ulric, another English saint, fasted till the skin was the only covering of his bones, and nightly descended into a vessel filled with freezing water, in which he continued during the hours of darkness.§ Benedict, the father of the Benedictine Order, was obliged, according to the Breviary, to roll his naked body in nettles and thorns, till the lacerated carcass, through pain, had lost all sense of pleasure.|| Such are a few specimens of the austerities men have inflicted on themselves, in the vain and mistaken effort to be wiser than God. Whether we consider, then, the widespread immorality of the many, or the self-inflicted misery of the few, it was not without good reason that Pope Pius II. gave utterance to the well-known sentiment which his historian Platina has recorded, that "though there was good reason for taking away the right of marriage from priests, yet there was far better reason for restoring it to them again."¶

And why should not the attempt to restore this right to the clergy be made? Bellarmine and all the great authorities allow that the Pope can dispense with vows of celibacy. Popes have done this before repeatedly for individuals, why not for an entire nation? The object to be gained is certainly worth an effort. Why should not Pope Pius IX. give effect to the recorded sentiments of Pius II.? Sure we are that the repeal of the law of clerical celibacy would be hailed by the clergy with more heartfelt satisfaction, and be productive of more real benefit to the Church, than the new dogmatic decree on the Immaculate Conception.

CHRISTIAN MINISTERS NOT SACRIFICING PRIESTS.

THERE is an obvious connection between the idea of the Lord's Supper, regarded as a proper sacrifice, and that of the Christian ministry considered as a sacrificing priesthood. One of these notions implies and involves the other. Which of the two was first in order of historical development is an interesting subject of inquiry, into which, however, we cannot now enter. Suffice it to say, that the weight of probability is on the side of the priority of the notion of a Christian priesthood, which then necessarily gave birth to the correlative notion of a proper sacrifice in the Eucharist. The Council of Trent, indeed, decided that both one and the other—the sacrifice and the priesthood—were instituted by our Lord himself; the appointment of the priesthood being subsequent to, and a consequence of the institution of the sacrifice. The following are the words of the decree**—"Sacrifice and priesthood are, by the ordinance of God, in such wise conjoined, as that both have existed in every law. Whereas, therefore, in the New Testament, the Catholic Church has received, from the institution of Christ, the holy visible sacrifice of the Eucharist, it must needs also be confessed, that there is in that Church, a new, visible, and external priesthood, into which the old has been translated. And the sacred Scriptures show, and the tradition of the Catholic Church has always taught, that this priesthood was instituted by the same Lord, our Saviour; and that to the Apostles, and their successors in the priesthood, was the power delivered of consecrating, offering, and administering His body and blood, as also of forgiving and retaining sins."

In proof that our Lord constituted his Apostles and their successors proper sacrificing priests, the Council here refers us to the testimony of Scripture, and to the tradition of the Catholic Church. We propose to consider the validity of both these alleged proofs, and we shall begin with the testimony of Holy Scripture.

How little support Scripture lends to the dogma of a human priesthood under the Christian dispensation, was implicitly acknowledged at the Council of Trent itself, by a learned Portuguese theologian,†† who counselled the Fathers to abandon the attempt to prove from Scripture that the Eucharist was a sacrifice, and to content themselves with resting the weight of their proof upon the testimony of tradition. He even went so far as to discuss, one by one, the passages of Scripture which were

* Jam vero matrimonium impedit imprimis, ut ait Hieronymus, munus sacrificandi, quia summa quædam puritas atque sanctitas in eo requiritur.—Bellarm., lib. i., de Cler. c. 19, Tom. i., p. 115. Colon. 1615.

† Si quis dixerit, per ipsa novæ legis sacramenta ex opere operato non conferri gratiam, anathema sit.—Decret. Conc. Trid. Sess. vii., Can. 8.

‡ Omnes apostoli, excepto Johanne et Paulo uxores habuerunt.—S. Ambros. opera, col. 1961. Par. 1549.

§ 'Ο μόντος Κλημης διά τούτ' ἀθετοῦντας γάμον, τούς τῶν Ἀποστόλων ἑξετασθέντας ἐν συνήγαις καταλέγει, φάσκον, ὅτι καί τούς Ἀποστόλους ἀποδοκίμασεν; Πέτρος μὲν γάρ καὶ Φίλιππος παῖδες ποιήσαντο.—Euseb., Hist. iii., 30, p. 124, Cantab., 1720.

* In tota Scriptura nullum tale extat præceptum.—Bellarm., de Cler. lib. i., c. 18, Tom. i., p. 113. Colon. 1615.

† Τὸν τῆς μάς γυναῖκος ἀνδρὰ πανν ἀποδεχεται, καὶ πρεσβύτερος ἦ, καὶ διακόνος, καὶ λαϊκός.—Clem. Alex., Strom., tom. i., p. 552. Oxon., 1715.

‡ Complures etiam alii inveniantur, qui de sacerdotibus nati apostolice sedis præfuerunt.—Corp. Jur. Can. Tom. i., Decret. pars i., Di-t. lvi., Paris, 1695.

§ Si l'on permettoit aux pretres de se marier, l'interet de leurs familles, de leurs femmes et de leurs enfans les tiroit de la dependance du Pape. En peu de temps, l'autorite du Saint Siege se borneroit a la ville de Rome.—Paolo Sarpi. Hist. Conc. Trid., Tom. ii., p. 254. Amsterdam, 1731.

* Sola libidinum incendia bulliebant Hieron. Oper. Tom. iv., col. 130. Paris, 1706.

† Moreti, Tom. iv., p. 172.

‡ Uccarnis inedia suparet, cilecio carnem domabat asperitimo. Hieme, gelu et nive rigenti, nudus flumen ingressus, nocte ibi tota et usque ad colium submersus, orationes et psalmos cum lacrymis profundeabat.—M. Paris, p. 114. Zurich, 1589.

§ M. Paris, ut supra, p. 89.

|| Nadum se in urticas ac vepres tamdin volutavit, dum voluptatis sensus dolore penitus opprimeretur.—Brev. Rom., ad Mar. 21.

¶ Sacerdotibus magna ratione sublatas esse nuptias, majori restitutas videri.—Platina, in vita Pii. II., p. 302. Colon. 1574.

** Sess. xxiii., cap. i. Waterworth's Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, pp. 170-1.

†† His name, according to Sarpi (lib. 274), was George d'Ataide; according to Pallavicino, Francois Foriero.